4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,867	03/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS9-2001-0143-US1	8109

	7590	11/04/2004

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
P.O. Box 81641
Austin, TX 78708-1641

EXAMINER
TRAN, TONGOC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/817,867	DUTTA, RABINDRANATH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tongoc Tran	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 March 2001</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/1/2004, 9/20/200*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to Applicant's application serial no. 09/817867

filed on 3/26/2001. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/1/2004 and 9/20/2004

have been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-3, 9 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,720).

In respect to claim 1, Lewis discloses a method of managing customer security

features by a security server, said method comprising:

receiving a request from a requestor (see col. 3, lines 3-12);

authenticating the requestor (see col. 3, lines 12-25); and

manipulating one or more security features stored in a data area corresponding

to a customer in response to the request (see col. 3, lines 25-55).

In respect to claim 2, Lewis discloses the method as described in claim 1 wherein

at least one of the security features is selected from the group consisting of a

photograph of the customer, a customer signature, a digital signature corresponding to

the customer, a fingerprint, and a description of the customer (see col. 3, lines 26-33,

photograph of the customer).

In respect to claim 3, Lewis discloses the method as described in claim 1 further

comprising:

receiving one or more new security features from the customer; assigning an

item identifier to each of the new security features; and storing the new security features

in the data area corresponding to the customer (see col. 3, lines 26-34).

In respect to claims 9 and 12-15, the claim limitations are substantially similar to

claims 1-3. Therefore, claims 9 and 12-15 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-8, 10-11 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,720).

In respect to claim 4, Lewis discloses the method as described in claim 1 further comprising:

receiving an authorization from a customer (see col. 3, lines 25-55),

Lewis does not disclose the authorization including a first merchant identifier;

storing the authorization; receiving a retrieval request from a merchant, the retrieval request including a customer identifier corresponding to the customer and a second merchant identifier corresponding to the merchant; validating the merchant request, the validating including:

retrieving the authorization; and comparing the first merchant identifier to the second merchant identifier; and returning one or more security features corresponding to the customer in response to the first merchant identifier matching the second merchant identifier. However, an authentication server acting as a proxy or agent to provide authentication service (e.g. receiving authorization, storing authorization and authenticating the receiver before secure information is released) is old and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Lewis ticket generation system by providing an authentication system acting as an agent between the ticket purchaser and the ticket vendor for the benefit of saving both the purchasing and the vendor time and resources.

In respect to claim 5, Lewis discloses the method as described in claim 1, further comprising: receiving an authorization from a customer (see Lewis, col. 3, lines 25-55). Lewis does not discloses the authorization including a public key corresponding to the merchant; storing the authorization and the merchant's public key; receiving an encrypted retrieval request from a merchant, the encrypted retrieval request encrypted using a private key corresponding to the merchant's public key; deciphering the encrypted retrieval request using the stored public key; and returning one or more security features corresponding to the customer in response to the deciphering. However, an authentication server acting as a proxy or agent to provide authentication service (e.g. receiving authorization, storing authorization and authenticating the receiver before secure information is released) is old and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Lewis ticket generation system by providing an authentication system acting as an agent between the ticket purchaser and the ticket vendor for the benefit of saving both the purchasing and the vendor time and resources. Furthermore using public key system for authentication is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the public key system to authenticate the merchant before secure information is released to him because only the merchant whose public key is sent to the authentication server to decrypt the message have the secret key to encrypt the message.

In respect to claims 6 and 7, Lewis discloses the method as described in claim 1. Lewis does not discloses receiving an edit request from a customer, the edit request

including a customer identifier and one or more updated security features, the security features each including an security item identifier; locating a stored security feature corresponding to each of the security item identifiers; and replacing the stored security features with the updated security features; verifying the customer including: receiving a secret customer identifier from the customer; and comparing the secret customer identifier with the stored secret customer identifier corresponding to the customer. However, an authentication server acting as a proxy or agent to provide authentication service is old and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Lewis ticket generation system by providing an authentication system acting as an agent between the ticket purchaser and the ticket vendor for the benefit of saving both the purchasing and the vendor time and resources. Furthermore, updating secure information (e.g. merchant has changed public key) from a user to the authentication server is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the updating of secure information and to be authenticated before purchaser is authorized to make changes in order to ensure the security changes made is from the proper party.

In respect to claim 8, the claim limitation is similar to claim 5. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 10-11 and 16-20, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 4-7. Therefore, claims 10-11 and 16-20 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached at (571) 272-3843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT
October 28, 2004

GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100